



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/653,609        | 09/02/2003  | Brian Jay Vondruska  | 201PP029A           | 3691             |
| 37535             | 7590        | 11/24/2006           |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER          |             |                      |                     |                  |
| SILVERMAN, ERIC E |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT          |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 1615              |             |                      |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                           |                         |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>                    | <b>Applicant(s)</b>     |  |
|                              | 10/653,609                                | VONDRAUSKA, BRIAN JAY   |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Eric E. Silverman, PhD | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1615 |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1 – 26 are pending in this action.

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

- I.     Claims 1 – 11, drawn to a method of compatibilizing an anionic polymeric rheology modifier, classified in class 523, subclass 1+.
- II.    Claims 12 – 15 and 17 – 19, drawn to a composition of matter comprising a cationic material complexed with an anioinic complexing agent, classified in class 522, subclass 1+.
- III.   Claims 20 – 21 and 24, drawn to a hair care product, classified in class 424, subclass 70.11+.
- IV.    Claim 26, drawn to a hand sanitizing gel, classified in class 424, subclass 405.
- V.     Claim 25, drawn to a household product, classified in class 510, subclass 1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product may be made by another materially different process. The process of Group I requires

that the cationic materials be complexed with an anionic material prior to combining with the rheology modifier. The product of Group II could be made by a process where such complexing occurred after combination with the rheology modifier.

Inventions I and III – V are directed to an unrelated product and process. Product and process inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that the product cannot be used in, or made by, the process. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06. In the instant case, the products of Groups III – V are a hair care composition, a household product, or a skin sanitizer. The method of Group I does not make any of these products; Group I relates to a process that makes a mixture of a polymer and a rheology modifier.

Inventions II and III – V are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a commodity plastic and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions III, IV and V are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP

§ 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have different modes of operation, functions, and effects. The hair care products of Group III operate by being applied to the hair, and have the function and effect of improving the cleanliness or feeling of hair. The skin sanitizer of Group IV operates by being applied to the skin, and has the function and effect of disinfecting the skin. The mode of operation of the household product of Group V is to be placed in or about a dwelling place, and the function and effect of improving the appearance, functionality, or pleasant nature of a dwelling place. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: different anionic complexing agents and different rheology modifiers. The species are independent or distinct because each has a different

chemical formula and composition, and thus has correspondingly different chemical and physical properties.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant must make the following elections:

- 1) Applicants must elect a single chemical structure that defines the rheology modifier, **and in addition**,
- 2) Applicants must elect a single chemical structure that defines the complexing agent.

**Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.** An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Because this requirement is complex, an response was not solicited by telephone.

Art Unit: 1615

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric E. Silverman, PhD whose telephone number is 571 272 5549. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 571 272 8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eric E. Silverman, PhD  
Art Unit 1615

  
MICHAEL P. WOODWARD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600